



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,542	07/19/2001	Sheng Li	3442P015	1961
8791	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			HAILE, FEBEN	
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	
SEVENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			2616	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/909,542

Applicant(s)

LI, SHENG

Examiner

Feben M. Haile

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In view of applicant's amendment filed March 30, 2006, the status of the application is still pending with respect to claims 1-21.

2. The amendment filed is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-21 based upon Khotimsky et al. (US 6,788,686) as set forth in the last Office action because:

Regarding claim 1, the addition of the material "wherein a data packet includes a packet header and each of the data frames included in the data packet is associated with the packet header" fails to further limit the scope of the claim, therefore the subject matter is not patentable over the prior art of record. Khotimsky discloses a packet **(interpreted as a frame)** transmitted on a path **(interpreted as a packet)** having a header, wherein the header includes a field called a Next Path value that identifies the id of the path that the packet is to be dispatched to **(column 13 lines 22-25)**. Therefore it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the id used by the packet **(interpreted as a frame)** to identify the path **(interpreted as a packet)** could be in the form of a header.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2616

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Khotimsky et al. (US 6,788,686), hereinafter referred to as Khotimsky.

Regarding claim 1, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: assigning a plurality of consecutive data frames to different data packets (**figure 4; packets 0-7 are assigned to 3 different paths**), each data packet including data frames that are sufficiently far apart such that loss of any particular data packet distributes impact that the loss has on quality of recovered data (**figure 4 and column 2 lines 47-49; each path includes packets that are 3 frames apart**), said assigning preventing each data packet from including consecutive data frames (**figure 4; none of the assigned 0-7 packets on the 3 different paths are consecutive**), and wherein a data packet includes a packet header and each of the data frames included in the data packet is associated with the packet header (**column 13 lines 22-25; a packet transmitted on a path has a header, wherein the header includes a field called a Next Path value that identifies the id of the path that the packet is to be dispatched to (column 13 lines 22-25; it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the id used by the packet to identify the path could be in the form of a header).**

Regarding claim 2, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: packing said each data packet with assigned frames; and sending the data packets to a destination node (**column 1 line 66-column 2 line 3; incoming data flow is partitioned into segments and forwarded on multiple paths to a destination).**

Regarding claim 3, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said each data packet includes data frames that are at least two frames apart (**figure 4; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart**).

Regarding claim 4, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said data frames are audio frames (**column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, voice**).

Regarding claim 5, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said assigning distributes data frames into different packets at a uniform interval (**figure 4; packets 0-7 are distributed into paths 1-3 at a uniform interval of 3 packets apart**).

Regarding claim 6, Khotimsky discloses the limitations of base claim 5.

Khotimsky further teaches distributing data frames into different paths at a uniform interval of 3 (**figure 4**).

It would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to increase Khotimsky's uniform interval from 3 to 5. The motivation being to amplify the gap between frames in a packet to decrease the impact that a lost packet would have on the quality of recovered data.

Regarding claim 7, this claim was cancelled.

Regarding claim 8, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said assigning plurality of consecutive data frames includes assigning a current data frame of said plurality of consecutive data frames to a packet that is at least two packets away from a packet that contains a previous data frame (**figure 4; current packet 3 is assigned to path 1 and previous packet 2 is assigned to path 3, which is 2 paths away**).

Regarding claim 9, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: distributing the data frames among a plurality of data packets, each data packet including the data frames from different parts of the multimedia entity (**figure 4; consecutive packets 0-7 are assigned to 3 different paths**), where said data frames from different said plurality of data packets parts are sufficiently spread out among to reduce the impact of a packet consecutive data frames into loss on quality of recovered data compared to packing sequential data packets (**figure 4 and column 2 lines 47-49; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart**), said distributing preventing each data packet from including consecutive data frames (**figure 4; none of the assigned 0-7 packets on the 3 different paths are consecutive**).

Regarding claim 10, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said multimedia entity includes a video frame (**column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, video**).

Regarding claim 11, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said multimedia entity includes a graphical image (**column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, video**).

Regarding claim 12, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said sufficiently spreading out includes packing a data packet with data frames that are at least two frames apart (**figure 4; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart**).

Regarding claim 13, Khotimsky discloses the limitations of base claim 9.

Khotimsky further teaches at least 4 paths for distributing frames (**figure 4**).

It would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to increase Khotimsky's uniform interval from 4 to 5. The motivation being to amplify the gap between frames in a packet to decrease the impact that a lost packet would have on the quality of recovered data.

Regarding claim 14, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: a processor configured to assign a plurality of consecutive data frames to different data packets **(figure 11 unit 200 and column 14 lines 12-15; a load balancer computes dispatch paths for incoming packets)**, preventing each data packet from including consecutive data frames **(figure 4; none of the packets 0-7 that are dispatched on different paths are consecutive)**, wherein each data packet is to include data frames that are sufficiently far apart such that loss of any particular data packet distribute impact that the loss has on quality of recovered data **(figure 4 and column 2 lines 47-49; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart)**; and a packetizer to pack a current frame into a data packet assigned by said processor **(figure 11 unit 230 and column 14 lines 20-23; a demultiplexer uses the computed dispatch paths to output the packets to their respective paths)**.

Regarding claim 15, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said data frames are audio frames **(column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, voice)**.

Regarding claim 16, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said data packet includes data frames that are at least two frames apart **(figure 4; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart)**.

Regarding claim 17, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: a frame to receive a sequence of data frames including consecutive parts of a segmented data entity (**figure 11; an ingress packet dispatch engine**); and a frame assigning element arranged to assign a current data frame in said sequence of data frames to a data packet, preventing each data packet from including consecutive data frames (**figure 11 unit 200 and column 14 lines 12-15; a load balancer computes dispatch paths for incoming packets, where none of the packets that are dispatched on different paths are consecutive**), wherein said frame assigning element assigns frame to the data packet different from a data packet containing a previous data frame (**figure 4 and column 2 lines 47-49; each path includes packets that are 3 packets apart**).

Regarding claim 18, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said segmented data entity is a video frame (**column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, video**).

Regarding claim 19, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: wherein said segmented data is an audio sequence (**column 1 lines 16-21; exchanging information, voice**).

Regarding claim 20, Khotimsky discloses the limitations: a frame packing element to pack data frames into assigned data packets (**figure 11 unit 230 and column 14 lines 20-23; a demultiplexer uses the computed dispatch paths to output the frames to their respective paths**).

Regarding claim 21, Khotimsky discloses the limitations of base claim 1.

Khotimsky further teaches a fixed or random pattern of assigning segments to paths (**Figure 4 and Figure 7**).

It would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Khotimsky's fixed or random pattern could have been a Gaussian distribution. The motivation being Gaussian distribution deals with probability and probability deals with certain (fixed) or uncertain (random) patterns, which Khotimsky fairly suggests.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6 of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully traverses that Khotimsky does not disclose or suggest "said assigning preventing each data packet from including consecutive data frames". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Khotimsky discloses for each arriving packet (**interpreted as frames**) computations are performed to determine a path (**interpreted as packets**) the packets (**interpreted as frames**) (**column 14 lines 11-67**). It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that manipulation of the mathematical expressions prove that the packets (**interpreted as frames**) would be assigned to paths (**interpreted as packets**) in a non-consecutive order. Figures 4, 7, and 8 each show the paths (**interpreted as packets**) including packets (**interpreted as frames**) that are not consecutive in order.

On page 8 of the amendment, the Applicant respectfully traverses that Khotimsky does not disclose or suggest “wherein a data packet includes a packet header and each of the data frames included in the data packet includes a packet header and each of the data frames included in the data packet is associated with the packet header”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Khotimsky discloses a packet (**interpreted as a frame**) transmitted on a path (**interpreted as a packet**) having a header, wherein the header includes a field called a Next Path value that identifies the id of the path that the packet is to be dispatched to (**column 13 lines 22-25**). Therefore it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the id used by the packet (**interpreted as a frame**) to identify the path (**interpreted as a packet**) could be in the form of a header.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Feben M. Haile whose telephone number is (571) 272-3072. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ST 061012006


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER